

should be deducted from the Montmorency & Charlevoix railway, and the Megantic railway on a proper valuation being proved.

I have taken up some time, but I think it is well worth the time to have it on record. Just shortly, I want to give my deductions from this judgment—and I desire to state that I have gone over it very hurriedly since the discussion started, but I think I have correctly summarized the judgment as to the figures.

Mr. COCHRANE: Is it a judgment or statement?

Mr. CARVELL: I have read the judgment.

Mr. COCHRANE: Is it a judgment?

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is not a final judgment.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is a statement.

Mr. CARVELL: It is quite a statement.

Mr. COCHRANE: I agree with you.

Mr. CARVELL: If I started out to reargue the case with that statement before me I would have a very hard job. I am going to give the deductions which I drew from that statement so far as possible. I admit there are some things which are obscure.

Mr. NESBITT: It is his judgment.

Mr. CARVELL: It is his judgment.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, it is not his judgment.

Mr. CARVELL: You can have your views, and I will have mine. It is his judgment, and is headed "Judgment delivered 24th day of January, 1914," and it will go down to all time as the judgment of Mr. Justice Cassels, and will be reported in the Exchequer Court Reports of Canada, and it provides that if they want to appeal from it they have the right to do so, and we are told they have not appealed. If they do appeal we will have another judgment in the Supreme Court of Canada Reports either confirming or disagreeing with this judgment. I have taken these three railways in the order in which Judge Cassels discusses them. I take the claim of the Quebec and Montmorency railway at \$2,038,149, and I take the total of the two amounts of \$500,000 and \$749,869, which is \$1,294,869, and subtract it from the \$2,038,149, which leaves the value of the Quebec and Montmorency road at \$743,280, less of course deductions. In the judgment there

[Mr. Carvell.]

are no figures as to amounts expended upon construction since 1st July, 1898. I take it they are very inconsiderable and would play no important part whatever in the final statement of the case.

Mr. REID: Do I understand that the hon. member figures up the cost of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix as \$743,280?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. REID: You are making those deductions from what amount?

Mr. CARVELL: From \$2,038,149. There may have been some amounts expended on construction after 1st July, 1898, but if there are any, Sir Walter Cassels makes no reference to them in his judgment.

I come next to the Lotbinière and Megantic, and we have so little evidence on this that I take the statement as I find it. Thirty miles at \$11,000 a mile amounts to \$330,000. I take next the Quebec and Saguenay. The total amount claimed by the company would be \$5,543,260. Sir Walter Cassels says that from that should be deducted the three items:

Commissions, including commissions on bonds . . . . .	\$ 863,000
Commissions of other kinds . . . . .	63,465
Interest . . . . .	1,012,950
Total . . . . .	\$1,939,415

I subtract that from the total claim, and I have a balance left of \$3,503,845. Add to that the other two amounts, namely, \$743,280 and \$330,000, and I have a total of \$4,577,125 as the cost of the three lines of railway. I first take from that the \$2,500,000 bond issue, because Sir Walter Cassels says that the bond indebtedness is a first charge and first payment. That brings the total down to \$2,077,125. Then there must be deducted from that the amount of subsidies. I have no positive evidence, but I am assuming that there would be double subsidies. The Dominion subsidies would amount to \$672,000 only on the Quebec and Saguenay and the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix. That is, the subsidies on the total line from Quebec to Murray Bay would be 105 miles at a double subsidy of \$6,400 per mile, or \$672,000. Adding that to the amount of \$440,000 contributed by the province of Quebec, I have a total of \$1,112,000 of subsidies. I have no knowledge of whether any subsidies were paid on the Lotbinière and Megantic, therefore, I have not taken that into the calculation, but it may be possible that I have charged too much for the subsidies on the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix, so that I